UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,699	09/19/2003	Liang-Jie Zhang	SOM920030006US1	6039

59559   7590   12/04/2008
RYAN, MASON & LEWIS, LLP
90 FOREST AVENUE
LOCUST VALLEY, NY 11560

EXAMINER
PARK, JEONG S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2454	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/04/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *9/22/2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13,15-26 and 28-36* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-13,15-26 and 28-36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is in response to Application No. 10/665,699 filed on

9/19/2003. The amendment presented on 9/22/2008, which cancels claims 14 and 27,

and amends claims 1, 19, 29, 30, 35 and 36, is hereby acknowledged. Claims 1-13, 15-

26 and 28-36 have been examined.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13, 15-26 and 28-36 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-5, 9-13, 16-26, 28-34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (hereinafter Johnson)(U.S. Patent No.

2003/0023679 A1) in view of Hugh et al. (hereinafter Hugh)(U.S. Pub. No.

2002/0089551 A1), and further in view of Huang et al. (hereinafter Huang)(U.S. Patent

No. 6,611,835 B1).

Regarding claims 1, 29, and 36, Johnson teaches as follows:

A method or an article of manufacture for use by at least one entity (client

workstation (originator), reference character 50 in figure 2) in participating in a

collaborative information exchange with at least one other entity (client workstation

(receiver), reference character 52 in figure 2)(collaboration between networked

computer users, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0018]), the method comprising the steps

of:

Obtaining annotation data (URL of the content), the annotation data comprising

one or more links (URL) to information associated with the collaborative information

exchange (the transmission of the collaborative content and the subject drawing by

exchanging the URL of the content and rendering instructions as part of that URL, see,

e.g., page 2, paragraph [0023]) and comprising at least one hierarchical representation

defining one or more of (i) an indication of organizational data entities; (ii) a specification

of collaborating entities; (iii) a specification of content type pertinent to collaborating

entities (iv) a specification of access control information; (v) a specification of

dependency information for organizational data entities; and (vi) a specification of a type

of business construct defining collaboration activity (the encoded representation of

collaborative content comprises of rendering instructions as part of URL which is the

same as the specification of content type pertinent to collaborating entities, see, e.g.,

page 2, paragraph [0023]); and

Transmitting at least a portion of the annotation data (URL of the content) to the

at least one other entity (a client workstation or receiver) such that the at least one other

entity may access at least a portion of the information associated with the collaborative

information exchange by selecting at least one of the one or more links (the

collaborative content transmitted to a client workstation (receiver) need only include a

URL and rendering instructions to enable a user to view the collaborative content, see,

e.g., page 3, paragraph [0027], lines 16-20) and may utilize at least a portion of the annotation data defined in the at least one hierarchical representation (once the collaborative content with the annotation is received by the receiver, the receiver can become an originator and create collaborative content or revise the collaborative content, see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0062]); and

Selecting at least one of the one or more links (the client workstation receives the collaborative content data only including a URL by selects the URL see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0062]).

Johnson does not explicitly teach the annotation data as a hierarchical representation.

Huge teaches as follows:

One hierarchical representation is structured to be capable of an indication of organizational data entities (Semi-Hierarchical arrangement allows users to store information in a purely hierarchical structure. For example a company may wish to store information organized by the management divisions within the company, see, e.g., page 17, paragraph [0192]);

The TeamBrain allows thoughts can contain files, web page shortcuts, network file shortcuts and annotation notes (see, e.g., page 17, paragraph [0192]); and

The TeamBrain server (3170 in figure 38) provides an ideal context for collaborative communication and allows people to view relationships among the various pieces of information (see, e.g., page 34, paragraph [0563]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Johnson to include hierarchical structure information used in

collaborative communication as taught by Huge in order to effectively provide

collaborating people much larger global picture of stored documents by clearly

indicating relationships among the stored documents.

Johnson in view of Huge does not explicitly teach of the annotation data

comprising metadata associated with at least one target document of the one or more

links.

Huang teaches as follows:

Creating metadata associated with links (the crawlers generate XML encoded

RDF summaries which include among other metadata, a list of annotations made by

parent-URLs and a list of annotations made about child-URLs, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 1-

7);

Metadata associated with Web sources (metadata refers to data describing Web

sources and the metadata is about a particular Web page includes link-structure

information which describes the hyperlinks to and from the given page, see, e.g., col. 5,

lines 18-49); and

Metadata used with the summary page (the crawler generates a summary page

for each page that it fetches using such metadata, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 50-61).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine Huang with Johnson in view of Huge to include generating

metadata includes the annotations information of Web pages as taught by Huang in

order to provide summary of Web pages along with URLs of the Web pages among

collaborating group.

Also it would be obvious to select a Web page (equivalent to applicant's link)

based on the metadata provides summaries of Web pages.

Regarding claims 2 and 20, Johnson teaches that the selection of a link permits

the at least one other entity to access the information on a need basis (the receiver

sends the encoded representation of collaborative content to server to display it on

receiver's station, see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0062], lines 1-5).

Regarding claims 3 and 21, Johnson teaches that a link may be selected by the

at least one other entity at a time not contemporaneous with the time of receipt of the

annotation data (providing non-real time collaboration by posting the encoded

representation of collaborative content on message boards, news groups, see, e.g.,

page 2, paragraph [0025]).

Regarding claims 4, 22, and 32, Johnson teaches that the annotation data is

schema-less (the server process, reference character 53 in figure 2, receives an

encoded representation of the collaborative content as a URL and render the content for

presentation on the client workstations with rendering instructions given as part of that

URL, see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0063], lines 16-21, figure 4 and page 2, paragraph

[0023]).

Regarding claims 5 and 23, Johnson teaches that the step of embedding

information in a message transferred between the at least one entity and the at least

one other entity (rendering instructions, see, e.g., page 6, paragraph [0070], lines 9-13,

and encoded annotations, see, e.g., page 7, paragraph [0073], are embedded in the

collaborative content).

Regarding claims 9 and 24, Johnson teaches that messages exchanged are

governed by one or more message exchange patterns (see, e.g., page 5 paragraph

[0061] and figure 7).

Regarding claim 10, Johnson teaches that one or more message exchange

patterns comprise at least one of a construct (originator primitive and recipient primitive)

and a primitive (originator or recipient)(see, e.g., page 5 paragraph [0061] and figure 7).

Regarding claim 11, Johnson teaches that the one or more message exchange

patterns control at least one of non-structural and non-deterministic information

exchange flow (collaboration between networked computer users does not require a

dedicated collaboration application on the user's computer system, see, e.g., page 2,

paragraph [0018] and the server process renders the content for presentation on the

client workstations with rendering instructions given as part of that URL, see, e.g., page

5, paragraph [0063], lines 16-21 and page 2, paragraph [0023]).

Regarding claims 12 and 25, Johnson teaches that the obtaining step further

comprises retrieving the annotation data from storage (the encoded collaborative

content contains URL referencing the base document which is stored in a persistent

base document storage, reference character 55 in figure 2, see, e.g., page 5, paragraph

[0059], lines 10-12 and page 6, paragraph [0072], lines 11-12).

Regarding claims 13 and 26, Johnson teaches that the obtaining step further

comprises generating the annotation data (the originator generates the encoded

representation of collaborative content, see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0061], lines 11-18

and figure 7, step 71).

Regarding claims 16, 17, and 28, Johnson teaches that the collaborative

information exchange is performed in accordance with a design collaboration

application and at least one collaborating entity (originator, 50 in figure 2) communicates

with the design collaboration application (network collaboration system is utilized in the

drawing process between the originator and the recipient, see, e.g., page 6, paragraph

[0069] and figure 6).

Regarding claim 18, Johnson teaches modifying at least one of the annotation

data and organizational data, based on changes in at least one of project, task and

people assignments (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0022]).

Regarding claim 19, Johnson teaches as follows:

An apparatus for use by at least one entity (client workstation: originator,

reference character 50 in figure 2) in participating in a collaborative information

exchange with at least one other entity (client workstation: receiver, reference character

52 in figure 2) (collaboration between networked computer users, see, e.g., page 2,

paragraph [0018]);

The apparatus comprising a memory (reference character 16 in figure 1) and at

least one processor (reference character 14 in figure 1) coupled to the memory

operative (see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0029], lines 1-5 and figure 1);

To obtain annotation data, wherein the annotation data is interpreted as an

encoded representation of collaborative content (the originator generates the encoded

representation of collaborative content and send it to the receiver via a server, see, e.g.,

page 5, paragraph [0061], lines 11-18 and figure 7);

The annotation data (encoded representation of collaborative content)

comprising one or more links (URL part one and two) to information associated with the

collaborative information exchange (the encoded representation of collaborative content

consists of URL part one and two, the URL part one and two contain the base document

or content identifier, its location on a document repository, and detailed viewing

information and encoded annotations, see, e.g., page 6, paragraph [0072], page 7,

paragraph [0073] and figure 5); and

To transmit at least a portion of the annotation data to the at least one other

entity such that the at least one other entity may access at least a portion of the

information associated with the collaborative information exchange by selecting at least

one of the one or more links (once the encoded representation of collaborative content

is received by the receiver, the receiver sends it to the server to display by receiver,

see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0062] and figure 7, step 74-76).

Johnson does not explicitly teach the annotation data as a hierarchical

representation.

Huge teaches as follows:

One hierarchical representation is structured to be capable of an indication of

organizational data entities (Semi-Hierarchical arrangement allows users to store

information in a purely hierarchical structure. For example a company may wish to store

information organized by the management divisions within the company, see, e.g., page 17, paragraph [0192]);

The TeamBrain allows thoughts can contain files, web page shortcuts, network file shortcuts and annotation notes (see, e.g., page 17, paragraph [0192]); and

The TeamBrain server (3170 in figure 38) provides an ideal context for collaborative communication and allows people to view relationships among the various pieces of information (see, e.g., page 34, paragraph [0563]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Johnson to include hierarchical structure information used in collaborative communication as taught by Huge in order to effectively provide collaborating people much larger global picture of stored documents by clearly indicating relationships among the stored documents.

Johnson in view of Huge does not explicitly teach of the annotation data comprising metadata associated with at least one target document of the one or more links.

Huang teaches as follows:

Creating metadata associated with links (the crawlers generate XML encoded RDF summaries which include among other metadata, a list of annotations made by parent-URLs and a list of annotations made about child-URLs, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 1-7);

Metadata associated with Web sources (metadata refers to data describing Web sources and the metadata is about a particular Web page includes link-structure

information which describes the hyperlinks to and from the given page, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 18-49); and

Metadata used with the summary page (the crawler generates a summary page for each page that it fetches using such metadata, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 50-61).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Huang with Johnson in view of Huge to include generating metadata includes the annotations information of Web pages as taught by Huang in order to provide summary of Web pages along with URLs of the Web pages among collaborating group.

Also it would be obvious to select a Web page (equivalent to applicant's link) based on the metadata provides summaries of Web pages.

Regarding claim 30, Johnson teaches an apparatus comprising:

An annotation data generation tool for generating annotation data (originator generates the collaborative content, see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0061], lines 1-5);

A collaborative directory coupled to the annotation data generation tool for storing the generated annotation data (persistent base document storage, reference character 55 in figure 2, see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0059]); and

An annotation data manager (server process, reference character 53 in figure 2) coupled to the collaborative directory for managing the annotation data (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0026] and figure 2).

Johnson does not explicitly teach the annotation data as a hierarchical representation.

Huge teaches as follows:

One hierarchical representation is structured to be capable of an indication of

organizational data entities (Semi-Hierarchical arrangement allows users to store

information in a purely hierarchical structure. For example a company may wish to store

information organized by the management divisions within the company, see, e.g., page

17, paragraph [0192]);

The TeamBrain allows thoughts can contain files, web page shortcuts, network

file shortcuts and annotation notes (see, e.g., page 17, paragraph [0192]); and

The TeamBrain server (3170 in figure 38) provides an ideal context for

collaborative communication and allows people to view relationships among the various

pieces of information (see, e.g., page 34, paragraph [0563]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Johnson to include hierarchical structure information used in

collaborative communication as taught by Huge in order to effectively provide

collaborating people much larger global picture of stored documents by clearly

indicating relationships among the stored documents.

Johnson in view of Huge does not explicitly teach of the annotation data

comprising metadata associated with at least one target document of the one or more

links.

Huang teaches as follows:

Creating metadata associated with links (the crawlers generate XML encoded

RDF summaries which include among other metadata, a list of annotations made by

parent-URLs and a list of annotations made about child-URLs, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 1-7);

Metadata associated with Web sources (metadata refers to data describing Web sources and the metadata is about a particular Web page includes link-structure information which describes the hyperlinks to and from the given page, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 18-49); and

Metadata used with the summary page (the crawler generates a summary page for each page that it fetches using such metadata, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 50-61).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Huang with Johnson in view of Huge to include generating metadata includes the annotations information of Web pages as taught by Huang in order to provide summary of Web pages along with URLs of the Web pages among collaborating group.

Also it would be obvious to select a Web page (equivalent to applicant's link) based on the metadata provides summaries of Web pages.

Regarding claim 31, Johnson teaches the annotation data manager is responsive to a collaboration pattern, the collaboration pattern representing iterative actions that may occur between the one entity and the at least one other entity (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0026], figure 2 and page 5, paragraph [0061], figure 7).

Regarding claim 33, Johnson teaches a web-based interface for use in participating in the collaborative information exchange (see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0063] and figure 4).

Regarding claim 34, Johnson teaches the collaborative directory serves as a hub

for managing collaborative resources of multiple organizations that use the hub as a

central place to perform business collaboration (server and persistent base document

storage together serve as a hub for managing collaborative resources, see, e.g., page

5, paragraph [0059] and page 2, paragraph [0026]).

5.   Claims 6-8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Johnson et al. (hereinafter Johnson)(U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0023679 A1) in

view of Hugh et al. (hereinafter Hugh)(U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0089551 A1), Huang et al.

(hereinafter Huang)(U.S. Patent No. 6,611,835 B1), and further in view of Atkins et al.

(hereinafter Atkins)(U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0097410 A1).

Regarding claims 6-8, Johnson discloses the embedded information in a

message (rendering instructions, see, e.g., page 6, paragraph [0070], lines 9-13, and

encoded annotations, see, e.g., page 7, paragraph [0073], are embedded in the

collaborative content) as explained above.

Johnson does not disclose a status tracking function of the embedded

information to cause notification in the form of an alert type.

Atkins teaches as follows:

A system provides an online service for facilitating collaboration among several

individuals across a data network (see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0034], lines 1-3 and

figure 3);

A status tracking function for the collaborative information (shared collection of

objects)(network service site, reference character 320 in figure 3, tracks changes or

comments made to the shared collection of objects, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0038], lines 1-5);

A portion of the embedded information is employed to cause notification of one or more entities (the other collaborators) about a status of an action (the network service site dispatches update notifications to the other collaborators, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0038], lines 1-5); and

The notification is in the form of an alert type (forming of an alert type is inherent when sending notification message to the others via the asynchronous messaging channel, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0038], lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Johnson-Hugh-Huang to include providing notifications to the other collaborators for any change or comment made to the shared collection of objects as taught by Atkins in order to update the shared message (the shared collection of objects) quickly and promptly between the at least one entity and the at least one other entity (collaborators).

Regarding claim 15, Johnson in view of Hugh and Huang does not disclose for determining an individual or an authority to be notified.

Atkins discloses that the repository, reference character 320 in figure 3, sends asynchronous messages including the URL to the collaborating clients, 330 in figure 3, notifying them of the new updates contributed to the objects (see, e.g., page 7, paragraph [0073], lines 19-26).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Johnson in view of Huge and Huang to include sending notifications

to the determined individual or authority as taught by Atkins in order to update the

shared message quickly and promptly between collaborators.

6.   Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart

et al. (hereinafter Stewart)(U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0156693 A1) in view of Johnson

et al. (hereinafter Johnson)(U.S. Patent No. 2003/0023679 A1), and further in view of

Huang et al. (hereinafter Huang)(U.S. Patent No. 6,611,835 B1).

Regarding claim 35, Stewart teaches as follows:

A method of deploying a business collaboration system (an open market

collaboration system for enterprise wide electronic commerce, see, e.g., abstract and

figure 20), the method comprising the steps of:

Deploying at least one on-demand business collaboration (identify the trading

partners desired for the collaboration after determining the types of business

transactions based on an business strategy, which means the system deploys the

collaboration based on the demand, see, e.g., page 13, paragraph [0239]) hyperchain-

based (communicating using XML messages between the workflow server and the

collaboration server, see, e.g., page 11, paragraph [0172]) management apparatus for

use in one or more of (see, e.g., page 13, paragraph [0237]);

Defining at least one business collaboration process template (determine the

types of business transactions to be conducted, see, e.g., page 13, paragraph [0239],

lines 2-5 and);

Creating at least one set of data constructs (configuring the types of messages,

see, e.g., page 13, paragraph [0241], lines 11-13);

Selecting at least one other collaborating entity (trading partners) for information

exchange capable of acting on at least one set of business constructs (identify the

trading partners desired for the collaboration, see, e.g., page 13, paragraph [0239], lines

6-8);

Customizing a process template to support a selected set of business constructs

(define the collaboration process and trading partner roles, see, e.g., page 13,

paragraph [0241], lines 1-7 and also see, e.g., page 11, paragraph [0170], lines 8-12);

and

Generating at least one set of activities in a business construct with initial

collaborative data entities (begin trading activities, see, e.g., page 13, paragraph

[0245]).

Stewart does not explicitly teach of exchanging schema-less hierarchical

annotation linkage.

Johnson in view of Huang teaches of exchanging schema-less hierarchical

annotation linkage as presented above per claims 1.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine Stewart with Johnson in view of Huang to include exchanging

metadata with Web pages as taught by Johnson-Huang in order to provide summary of

Web pages along with URLs of the Web pages among collaborating group.

Conclusion

7.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to JEONG S. PARK whose telephone number is (571)270-

1597. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:00 - 3:30

EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. S. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2454

December 1, 2008

/Dustin Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2454